

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER FOSTER,	:	Case No. 2:22-cv-2153
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Algenon L. Marbley
	:	Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry
vs.	:	
	:	
OHIO DEPARTMENT OF	:	
REHABILITATION AND	:	
CORRECTION, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on several filings by Plaintiff Christopher Foster. First, in his “Motion for Clarification” (Doc. No. 54) Plaintiff asks whether the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA) “requires more than a basic screening, and filing fee payment.” (*Id.* at PageID 54.) He also poses a rhetorical question about the timing of such screenings. (*Id.*). This motion is **DENIED**. The PLRA screening standard has been set forth numerous times in this case, most recently in the undersigned’s Report and Recommendation. (*See* Doc. No. 53 at PageID 443-445.)

Second, Plaintiff has filed two Notices instructing the Clerk of Court to modify the docket of this case. (Doc. Nos. 55, 56.) The Court **STRIKES** these notices as inappropriate.

Third, in his “Good Faith Enlargement Motion Pro Se” (Doc. No. 65), Plaintiff asks for additional time “for all upcoming Court process.” (Doc. No. 65 at PageID 574,

577.) This motion is **DENIED** without prejudice. If Plaintiff requires additional time to meet any particular court deadline, he may ask for it. However, as Plaintiff is aware, the Court has ordered him to stop filing unsolicited documents in this case. (*See* Doc. No. 70.) No deadlines currently appear on the docket.

Fourth, in Plaintiff's "Reques[t] for Court on Basis of Castro Theory" (Doc. No. 66), Plaintiff complains about the delay in resolution of this case. He asks "if this case can stop forcing the Magistrate Judge to waist [*sic*] time using PLRA to put me on trial ..." (*Id.* at PageID 588.) To the extent Plaintiff is asking this Court not to comply with the PLRA, his request is **DENIED**. The Court will comply with the law.

To the extent Plaintiff asks the Court to order CoreCivic to sell him four Bic pens and to direct the Department of Justice to respond to his complaints (Doc. No. 66 at PageID 591), his requests are **DENIED**. The Court must screen Plaintiff's complaint to see if the case may proceed before any requests for relief can be addressed. His redundant unsolicited filings simply delay that step.

Fifth, in his "Motion for Court to Proceed" (Doc. No. 67), Plaintiff again criticizes the PLRA as "an outdated idea" and asserts that he has done "everything asked by this Court" and needs the case to move on. (*Id.* at PageID 598.) He asks the Court to grant him relief within the month or serve the defendants. (*Id.*) This Motion is **DENIED** for the reasons already explained.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Caroline H. Gentry
Caroline H. Gentry
United States Magistrate Judge